

### **Remarks**

Claims 1 and 3-9 have been found allowable. Applicants thank the examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 10, 13, and 15 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,956,493 ("Hewitt") in view of U.S. patent no. 5,970,234 ("Jin").

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt and Jin in view of U.S. patent no. 5,546,548 ("Chen").

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt and Jin in view of U.S. patent publication no. 2002/0120828 ("Modelski").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Claim 10 recites granting access to the bus based on, among other things, the existence of a sleep entry condition. The rejection cites Jin as teaching this limitation, and points to a section of Jin (in the first paragraph of col. 7) that describes granting the bus based on an idle condition. An idle condition is not the same as a sleep entry condition. As stated in the rejection, an idle condition refers to a period when a particular bus master does not request use of the bus because it has no need for the bus at that time. A sleep entry condition refers to a time when the processor, and possibly other circuitry as well, go into a non-operational state to save power. Such states are generally entered

by stopping the clock that controls such circuitry, and/or by removing power to such circuitry. However, other devices that use the bus may not participate in this sleep state, and therefore will still need bus arbitration, although the arbitration mechanism may have to be altered to accommodate the sleeping devices. The combination of Hewitt and Jin therefore do not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 10.

Claims 11 and 13-15 depend from claim 10, and therefore contain the same limitations not found in the cited references.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/John F. Travis/

Date: April 3, 2006

John F. Travis  
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone:

(512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026